Case 1.01-cv-01003-YK-EC Document 32 Filed 02/11/2002 Page 1-of 7

(32)

AFFIDAVIT OF ALLEN MORSLEY

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF EDGEFIELD) ss

I, ALLEN MORSLEY, BEING FIRST DULY SWORN ACCORDING PA

THE LAW, DEPOSE AND ATTEST AS FOLLOWS:

MARY E. D'ANDREA, CLERK

- 1. Prior To and During , My Trial and Direct Appeal, Defense Attorney Robert Cooper Failed to Advise me that the "Quantity" or "Type" of controlled Substance was An "Essential Element" Of the Substantive Aggravated Offense(s) For which I was Being Held to Answer , And for which I Received Punishment of Life Imprisonment.
- 2. Prior To, And During, My Trial And Direct Appeal, Defense Attorney Robert Cooper Never even Tried to Defend Me Against The "Essential Elements" Of the Substantive AggravatedOffense Involving The "Type" or "Quantity" Of Controlled Substances; And, He gave me "Critically" Incorrect Legal Advice" (And, Total Lack of Defense) Concerning The "Quantity" And "Type" Of Controlled Substance(s) that were "Essential Elements" Of The Substantive Aggravated Offense(s) For which I was being Neld to Answer, And for which I Received Punishment of Life Imprisonment.
- 3. During My Trial , Judge James C. Fox Essentially Instructed
 The Jury That it should Not Determine the "Quantity" O(r)
 "Type" Of Controlled Substance; He instructed the Jury It

Could Find Me "Guilty" If it Found that I Conspired with "Cocaine" (Making No Mention Of Cocaine Base).

- 4. That At Arraignment Judge James C. Fox Instructed Me That I Was Being Charged With Conspiracy To Distribute Cocaine. And then Asked Me How I Plead To These Charges , And I Said that I Was Not Guilty. (He Made No Mention Of Cocaine Base).
- 5. The "Jury" Returned A General Verdict , Only Finding Me "Guilty" Of Conspiracy Involving A "Detectable " Amount Of "Cocaine" The Judge , At Sentencing , (Rather than Jury) Found Me Guilty Of Conspiracy Involving (9) NINE OUNCES OF COCAINE BASE , And (5) OUNCES OF COCAINE By Using An Inaccurate "Preponderance" of evidence Test , Und He Imposed Life Imprisonment For Amount He (Not Jury) Determined.
- 6. Consequently , I <u>Never</u> Was Actually Provided A Trial By"Jury", Using The "Beyond" A Reasonable "Doubt" Standard, on the "Essential Elements" Of The Quantity or Type of The Controlled Substance For which I was Held To Answer , And For which I Received Punishment of Life Imprisonment.
- 7. I am Being Imprisoned And Punished For "Essential Elements" Of Crimes Without Any "Jury"Determination "Beyond A Reasonable Doubt", And, Without "Notice" In Indictment Prior To Trial .
- 8. Because of prevailing Circuit precedent ' At the time of My Trial And Direct Appeal, The Judge , Defense Attorney , And Myself Never Even Understood The Law(s) Concerning the Substantive Offense(s) For which I was Held to Answer ' And for which I

Received Punishment of Life Imprisonment Plus 5 Years.

- 9. After My Trial, And After My Direct Appeal, Then the Supreme Rendered it's opinions or Decisions in:

 BAILEY Vs. UNITED STATES, 516U.S. 137, 133L Ed 2d 472, 116 SCt 501.

 BOUSLEY Vs. UNITED STATES, 523 U.S. 614, 140 L Ed 2d 828, 118 SCt 1604.

 APPRENDI Vs. N.J., 530 U.S. 566 .
- 10. After Apprendi Was Decided By Supreme Court , Then Almost every Circuit Court in The Nation Overruled its Own Prior Precedent, And the Circuit Re-interpretated 841(a)(b)(1)(A)(B) , So As To Reconstrue and Finally Reveal that "Quantity" And "Type" Of Controlled Substances Are Now "Essential Elements" Of the Sustantive Offense(s) under 841(a) That Must be Determined By the "Jury" (Not Judge) "Beyond A Reasonable Doubt"; SEE, Cotton, 261 F.3d. 397 (4th. Cir)

 Rodgers, 228 F.3d. 1318(11th. Cir.)

 Gonzales, 259 F.3d. 355 (5th. Cir.).
- 11. After Apprendi, The Ninth Circuit Declared 841(b)1 (A)(B) To Be Facially "unconsttutional," SEE Buckland, 259 F.3d. 1157 (9th Cir. 2001) Affirmed en banc, F3d.
- 12. As A Result of the Above "Facts", I Believe it is Reasonable for me To Conclude, And Claim that Fundamental Defects Occurred During My Trial, Appeal, And in 2255 proceeding which Resulted in A Complete Miscarriage of Justice 'Because the Trial Judge, Defense Attorney, Court Of Appeals, And Defendant (me) Did Not Correctly

Understand The Law During those Critical Stages Of the Proceedings.

I Raised Bailey During Trial , On Direct Appeal , Within 2255 Motions

And Finally Within 2241 Motion Because Court Of Appeals Has Not

Ruled On the Merits Of Bailey Claim , After Bailey Was Decided.

And , I Am Being Imprisoned Under Statute that Interviening Constructio

Has Made Act Not Criminal.

- 13. I Am "Actually" Innocent of The (9) Nine Ounces Of Cocaine Base (5) Five Ounces Of Cocaine. I Am 'Actually" Innocent Of Using A Firearm During A Drug Trafficking Crime 924(C). I Am Not The Person Who Is Named In The Indictment. John Doe, Raleek, Or BalHead.
- 14. I Believe And Assert that "AEDPA" Is Unconstitutional, AS it Suspends And Delays Habeas Corpus, And that "AEDPA" Violates the Separate "Retroactivity" Standard Established By Supreme Court in DAVIS -Vs- U.S., And U.S. -Vs- SHELTON, 848 F.2d 1485 at 1489-1491 (10th Cir). [In Shelton, The Court of Appeals Recognized that Supreme Court In DAVIS Expressly Allowed Habeas Corpus RElief Based On Intervening Change In Circuit Precedent Construong "Elements" Of Offense, Not Based On Supreme Courts Interpretation Of Elements].
- 15. Further , In the Pre-Sentence INvestigation Report , it lists "Prior" Convictions (SEE P.S.I. PAGE #7).
- 16. However, In those "prior" Convictions, when Ipleaded "Guilty",
 The Judge Failed To Advise Me That I Could Have "Assistance" Of

Of Counsel During A <u>Trial</u>; He Did Advise Me I Could Have A Trial, But He Did <u>Not</u> Advise Me that I Was Entitled to "Assistance" OF Counsel During <u>trial</u>; And, I Did <u>Not</u> Knowingly or Voluntarily Waive My Right To "Assistance" Of Counsel For Trial Because I Did Not Know Or Understand That I had A "Continuing" Right to Assistance of Counsel For Trial.

- 17. I Believe it is Unconstitutional to "Enhance" My Current Federal Sentence Based on those "prior" Uncounseled Convictions, As the Petitioner Was Only A Child. See [PLEA HEARING]. And that A New Supreme Court Decision Allows Me to Challenge "Uncounseled" Priors. SEE DANIELS 121 SCt. (2001); JACKSON -vs-MILLER, 260 F.3d 769 (7th Cir. 2001) VONN -Vs-U.S., 224 F.3d. 1152, cert granted, 121 SCt. 1185 (2001) COOK -Vs-LYNAUGH, 821 F.2d. 1072 (5th Cir. 1987)

 GIDEON -Vs-WAINWRIGHT, 372 U.S. 335, 83 SCt. 792 (1963).
- 18. My Defense Attorney In My Current Federal Case[Robert Cooper], Failed To Research the Facts and Law Concerning My "Uncounseled" Priors, And He Caused Procedural Defaults by Failing to "Object" To uncounseled "Priors" Listed IN PSI Report. I Was Prejudiced By His Deficient Performance Because the "Priors" Enhanced" My Criminal History Categor Under the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines, And I Am "Suffering Anew" And Serving More Time In Prison Based In Part Upon "Prior" Violations Of My Right to "Assistance" Of Counsel.

- 19. I Have Tried To Get Claudia Simms To Help Me Get Discovery
 To Prove That I And Raleek Are Two Different People, But Claudia
 Simms (Government Witness) Has Since Past Away, (of Aids) As Well
 As Her Brother Claud Simms, How Government Alleged Had Indicated
 That Petitioner Was The One Who They Were Looking For' When The
 petitioner Was Arrested. But Died Before The Petitioner Or
 The Government Could Call On Him To Support What The Government Had
 Alleged, Or Denie Such Allegations. For At Detention Hearing
 Agent Fannelly ATF. Testified That Claud Simms Had Passed Away
 See (Detention Hearing) "Claud Simms Had Passed Away By Aids
 Related Illness.
- 20. Since Claudia Simms Passed Away I Had All But Given Up On ever Being Able To Find The Person "Raleek", But I Have Been Blessed' Only to Be Cursed Once Again! For the Person That Was Indicted IN Petitioners Place, One Raleek Has Passed Away Also! By Aids Related Ilness. Petitioner is still in The Process Of Gathering Information, Yet So Far I Have Been Able To Do Little But Assure that "Raleek" Died Between 1991 1992) or 1993. Of Aids In New York City.

I , ALLEN MORSLEY , HAVE READ THIS AFF. , AND IT IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE , INFORMATION AND BLIEFS.

ALLEN MOŔSLEY

subscribed and Sworn to Me This Day_5

Of Selman 200

- Summer B

ly Commission Expl September 17, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I ALLEN MORSLEY , THE PETITIONER IN THIS CASE , HEREBY UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY , SERVE COPY OF SAID AFFIDAVIT UPON THE FOLLOWING : MATHEW E. HAGGERTY U.S. Ass. ATTORNEY . BY PLACING COPY IN POST PAID ENVELOPE ADRESSED AS FOLLOWS.

MATHEW E. HAGGERTY

Ass. UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, 228 Walnut Street. Suite 220 P.O. Box 11754 HARRISBURG , Pa. 17108 - 1754 .

SERVED ON THIS DAY FEB. 5, 2002

OF THIS DO I NOW AFFIX MY HAND

MR. ALLEN MORSLEY. PETITIONER.

Witnessed by Robert Dugan FEBS, 2002.